United States district court

Boston, MASS,

[A. 04-13/99 MC)

Richard Blawson (Plaintiff)

Vs.

Suffolk county District Attorner's officer Longery Con Suffolk superior court case SUCK-2001-10249-1-18 Respondants

Plaintiffs motion for A Temporary restraining Order

A. Introduction

- 1. The plaintiff seeks a Temporary restraining order against the Suffall County prosecution scheduled for Trial on May 14th 2007 Bending A Double Jeopardy Claims, & Does so pursuant to Fedir, CiviP, 65.

 B. Parties
- 2. The plauntiff is a united states citizen and resides At MCI cedas Junction at P.O. Box 100, siwalpole, MA. 02071.
- 3. The respondent is The principle suffolk county prosecutor und a united state citizen employed At I Bullfinch pl. Baston, MA. 02210

5. In 2/16/01 Allegedly the plaintiff Armed carjacked A Ford Mustakge from an Individual at the decham mall in Norfolk County and Led DeDham police in a hot & Fresh pursuit into suffolk county where eventually an Arrest of the plaintiff was made and both counties

pressed charges; (see Attachment-A) & Attachment B-) Indictments SUCR-2001-10249 # 9 Through 18 Dated 2-16-01 & 2-17-01 only. Indictment 1- Through 8 are consolidated Indictments.

- 6. The plaintiff now claims the same conduct ie route of Escape, and the Possession of firearms & ammunition, his well as the use of the firearm, are All double Jeoparchy claims that the state court has rejected SJC 09424 Glawson V, Commonwealth 445 MASS, 1019 (2005).
- 7. The plaintiff was once put in Jeopardy of Life & Limb in Norfolk Superior court on 2/12/03 when Trial began but Ended in a guilty plea on 2/20/03.

 8. The plaintiff Avers the same course of conduct ie. the route of escape and All "charges committed durring that conduct is barred by Double Jeopardy Principles in the Suffalk county prosecution (Attach-B) 9. The plaintiff avers his was put in Jospardy for possession of A firearm & Ammunition in the Norfolk country Trial and Double Jesparchy principles bar a second prosecution for Identically the same offences & elements Blockburger V. V.S. 284 V.S. 299/52 SICTI 180 (1932), Benton V. Maryland 395 U.S. 784/89 Sict. 2056 (1969). Within the same soveriegnty, meaning that suffolk county is bardfrom reprosecutting the plaintiff for the same offense & elements that were already

prosecuted in Norfolk Country & in the same Soveriegnty, (see Attachment A Indictments 6 & 7) & (Attachment B Indictments 13 & 14,) Both counties Arrested the plaintiff & durring the Arrest found A firearm & charged the plaintiff with possession of A fire Arm. Benton V. Maryland forbade repeated Attempts to prosecute an Individual for the same offense! As Does the same elements test ANNOUNCED IN Blockburges V. Vis. supra). IN so much of the ammunition, in suffalk county As A Direct result of being Jeopardy bared by the Norfolk county prosecution for Identically the same offences.

10. The double Jeopardy Clause of the 5th amendment U.S.C.A. protects more then the actual imposition of two punishments for the same offense. by Also protecting the defendant from being placed twice in jeopaldy for such punishment, Witte V. Vis. 515 Vis. 389,

391\115,8,ct, 2199-2202-(1995)

11. A court must hear & determine a colorable claim of double Jeopardy before the trial because "if the right to be free from a second trial is not vindicated before that trial commences, then the right is No right at All. but a cruel Illusion, U.S. V. Casabello-cruz 59 F, 3rd 390 (1st cir 1995).

EDNCLUSION

13. For the foregone reasons the plaintiff should be given a Temporary restraining order against the respondents prosecution pending the resolution of the plaintiff double Jeopardy claims. At A Heasing in U.S. District court.

Varification

15. The plaintiff varifies the above facts to be true under penalties of perjury.

certification of service I Richard Blawson breety cestify the foregoine was mailed to A.B. Daniel Connelly At 1 Bullfirth FR, Boston MA, ON 5-4-57

date 5-4-07

Richard Blawson P.O. BOX 100 SiWalpole, MA. 02071